

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being fully anticipated by Eichenlaub (U.S. Patent No. 5,500,765) (hereinafter "Eichenlaub").

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Claim 11 has been amended, and new claims 13-15 have been added, to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. Claim 12 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-10 are pending, but are currently withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, claims 11 and 13-15 are currently pending and under consideration.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being fully anticipated by Eichenlaub. Claim 12 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of claim 12 moot. Claim 11 has been amended to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. To the extent that the rejection might be deemed to still apply to claim 11, as newly-amended, it is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 11 has been further amended to recite a lens adapter combination that also includes features directed to an "opening window" and a "panel unit." For example, the opening window is described in claim 11 as "formed on the attachment unit at a position confronting the display unit when the lens adapter is attached to the communication terminal

device.” The panel unit is described in claim 11 as “supporting the microlens unit and [being] attached to the attachment unit in a manner movable between a first position at which the microlens unit confronts the display unit and a second position at which the microlens unit does not confront the display unit.”

In the Office Action, claim 11 and 12 are rejected as being anticipated by Eichenlaub. With regard to newly-amended independent claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that Eichenlaub fails to teach, or even suggest, an opening window formed to confront the display unit of the communication terminal device in the manner recited in the claim. In column 4, lines 44 to 56, Eichenlaub teaches that the first lens sheet 16 is fixedly mounted on the display screen. As a result, Applicant respectfully submits that the arrangement in Eichenlaub thus includes no opening window in the manner recited in newly-amended independent claim 11. Therefore, in the device disclosed in Eichenlaub, the display unit is always covered by at least one sheet. On the contrary, in the lens adapter combination recited in newly-amended independent claim 11, the display unit is exposed through the opening window. Accordingly, a user can directly see the display unit when the panel unit is at the second position (i.e., the microlens unit does not confront the display unit). In addition, if the speaker is provided within the range of the opening window, the speaker is also exposed so that a user can clearly hear a voice that is output from the speaker, without being obstructed by the microlens unit. At least these features are neither shown, nor even suggested, by the applied Eichenlaub reference.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because Eichenlaub does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 11, as amended. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference

must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)."

Newly-Added Dependent Claims 13-15

New dependent claims 13-15 have been added, to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. For example, claims 13 and 14 describe features relating to folded parts used to attach the lens adapter to the communication terminal device. Also, claim 15 describe a feature in which the display unit and the speaker are exposed though the opening window. These new dependent claims are in condition for allowance at least because of their dependence from newly-amended independent claim 11, and the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of all outstanding objections and rejection, and request the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573.

This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Dated: September 9, 2005

By:



Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

Customer No. 55694

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20005-1209

Tel.: (202) 842-8800

Fax: (202) 842-8465